

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 23 MAR 2005

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

WIPO

PCT

## PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY  
(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/001309

International filing date (day/month/year)  
25.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)  
05.02.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
C07D231/20, A01N43/56

Applicant  
SUMITOMO CHEMICAL COMPANY, LIMITED

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☒ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Gregoire, A

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2994



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/001309

---

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/001309

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☒ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☐ The International Searching Authority has not been able to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed was not available to the International Searching Authority at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

---

**Box No. VI Certain documents cited**

---

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.10)

and /or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.9)

**see form 210**

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;  
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1) Reference is made to the following documents :**

- D1: EP-A-0 648 729 (SUMITOMO CHEMICAL COMPANY LIMITED) 19 April 1995  
(1995-04-19)  
D2: EP-A-0 376 598 (SUMITOMO CHEMICAL COMPANY, LIMITED) 4 July 1990  
(1990-07-04)

**2) Novelty (Art. 33 (1) and (2) PCT) :**

The present compounds differ from those of D1 in the presence of a pyrazolyl ring instead of the pyridyl ring reported therein and differ from those of D2 mainly in the position of the aryls containing chain on the pyrazole and the nature of the linkers between these aryls and the pyrazole.

The present application thus complies with Art. 33(2) PCT.

**3) Inventive Step (Art. 33 (1) and (3) PCT) :**

D1 is regarded as the closest prior art since it discloses structurally close insecticides and acaricides.

The present compounds differ from those of D1 in the presence of a pyrazolyl ring instead of a pyridyl ring.

The technical problem underlying the present application lies in the provision of further compounds active in noxious arthropod pests controlling composition.

The replacement of a pyridyl ring by a pyrazolyl ring is not suggested in D1. D2 reports pyrazole derivatives as pesticide but structurally further remote from those presently claimed so that the skilled person looking for further compounds having the desired activity would not have come to the specific compounds presently claimed. The application provides several examples showing that the compounds claimed solved the problem raised. The present application thus complies with Art. 33(1) and (3) PCT.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001309

**Re Item VI**

**Certain documents cited**

WO 2004/085405 A (SUMITOMO CHEMICAL COMPANY, LIMITED; HASHIZUME,  
MASAYA; SAKAMOTO, NORIY) 7 October 2004 (2004-10-07)

This document could be highly relevant in the regional examination phase for the assessment of novelty of the intermediates and/or for the assessment of inventive step of both the intermediates and the final compound if the priority claimed was found not to be valid.

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 23 MAR 2005

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

WIPO

PCT

PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/001309

International filing date (day/month/year)  
25.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)  
05.02.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
C07D231/20, A01N43/56

Applicant  
SUMITOMO CHEMICAL COMPANY, LIMITED

### 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☒ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1b/s(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

### 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Gregoire, A

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-2994



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/001309

---

**Box No. 1 Basis of the opinion**

---

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.  
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:  
☐ a sequence listing  
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:  
☐ in written format  
☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:  
☐ contained in the international application as filed.  
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.  
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/JP2005/001309

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☒ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. ☐ The International Searching Authority has not been able to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed was not available to the International Searching Authority at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.
4. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-16
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

---

**Box No. VI Certain documents cited**

---

1. Certain published documents (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.10)

and /or

2. Non-written disclosures (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 70.9)

**see form 210**



**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;  
citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1) Reference is made to the following documents :**

- D1: EP-A-0 648 729 (SUMITOMO CHEMICAL COMPANY LIMITED) 19 April 1995  
(1995-04-19)  
D2: EP-A-0 376 598 (SUMITOMO CHEMICAL COMPANY, LIMITED) 4 July 1990  
(1990-07-04)

**2) Novelty (Art. 33 (1) and (2) PCT) :**

The present compounds differ from those of D1 in the presence of a pyrazolyl ring instead of the pyridyl ring reported therein and differ from those of D2 mainly in the position of the aryls containing chain on the pyrazole and the nature of the linkers between these aryls and the pyrazole.

The present application thus complies with Art. 33(2) PCT.

**3) Inventive Step (Art. 33 (1) and (3) PCT) :**

D1 is regarded as the closest prior art since it discloses structurally close insecticides and acaricides.

The present compounds differ from those of D1 in the presence of a pyrazolyl ring instead of a pyridyl ring.

The technical problem underlying the present application lies in the provision of further compounds active in noxious arthropod pests controlling composition.

The replacement of a pyridyl ring by a pyrazolyl ring is not suggested in D1. D2 reports pyrazole derivatives as pesticide but structurally further remote from those presently claimed so that the skilled person looking for further compounds having the desired activity would not have come to the specific compounds presently claimed. The application provides several examples showing that the compounds claimed solved the problem raised. The present application thus complies with Art. 33(1) and (3) PCT.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001309

**Re Item VI**

**Certain documents cited**

WO 2004/085405 A (SUMITOMO CHEMICAL COMPANY, LIMITED; HASHIZUME,  
MASAYA; SAKAMOTO, NORIY) 7 October 2004 (2004-10-07)

This document could be highly relevant in the regional examination phase for the assessment of novelty of the intermediates and/or for the assessment of inventive step of both the intermediates and the final compound if the priority claimed was found not to be valid.